

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/929,683	08/14/2001	Marioara Mendelovici	1662/52104 9087		
26646	7590 04/19/2002				
KENYON & KENYON			EXAMINER		
ONE BROAD NEW YORK,			MORRIS, PATRICIA L		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1625		
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	A		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)  09/929,683 Mendelovici et al		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	- CHAPI	Group Art Unit	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	TiMorris		1625	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover shee	et beneath the c	orrespondence ac	idress
P ri d for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	DEXPIRE one	MONTH(S	S) FROM THE MAII	ING DATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rejet NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default,</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute</li> </ul>	ply within the statutory meexpire SIX (6) MONTHS	inimum of thirty (30) from the mailing dat	days will be considere	ed timely.
Status				
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on				·
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .				
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935			the merits is clos	sed in
Disposition of Claims				
C(Claim(s) 1-30		is/are	pending in the app	lication.
Of the above claim(s)				
□ Claim(s)	is/are	is/are allowed.		
□ Claim(s)	is/are	is/are rejected.		
□ Claim(s)		is/are	objected to.	
X Claim(s) 1 - 38	are su	are subject to restriction or election		
Application Papers		require		
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review. PTO-948.			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		d 🗆 disapprove	d.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	ted to by the Examine	er.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority un</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of t</li> <li>□ received.</li> </ul>	<del>-</del>			
<ul> <li>□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numbe</li> <li>□ received in this national stage application from the Inte</li> </ul>	=			
*Certified copies not received:			•	
Attachment(s)				
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	o(s)	☐ Interview Sumr	mary, PTO-413	
□ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	ſ	☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152		
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	8 !	☐ Other		

Office Acti n Summary

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.\_\_\_\_\_



Application/Control Number: 09/929,683

Art Unit: 1625

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a process of preparing, classified in class 546, subclass 158.
- II. Claims 12-22, drawn to a process of a preparing, classified in class 546, subclass153.
- III. Claims 23-26, drawn to a process of preparing, classified in class 546 subclass 157.
- IV. Claim 27, drawn to a process of preparing, classified in class 546, subclass 152.
- V. Claims 28-30, drawn to compounds, classified in class 546, subclass 156.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

These distinct inventions have acquired separate status in the art, will support separate patents, and will require different fields of search for the respective inventions. Accordingly, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is considered proper; 35 U.S.C. 121; 37 CFR 1.141; 37 CFR 1.142.

Inventions I-IV are drawn to patentably distinct processes. Groups I-IV are restricted out in separate Groups, as they are really multiple processes of preparing. MPEP 806.05(f) provides for restricting out such process claim where it can be established that more than one process of preparing the compounds can be employed to do so. Claims 1-27 are evidence claims that more than one different process may produce the compound cilostazol.



Application/Control Number: 09/929,683

Art Unit: 1625

Inventions I-IV and V are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made materially different processes as evidenced by applicants' own claims and specification.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In, <u>In re Weber</u>, 198 USPQ 332, <u>In re Hengehold</u>, 169 USPQ 473, was noted for the proposition that as long as applicants have maintained the right (as they do here) to file the non-elected subject matter in divisional applications, then restriction is proper, as to that point.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

This restriction requirement is being written as previous experience has indicated that with Foreign applicants and the inherent time delays, applicants' representative is better able to make an informed, correct, election of the invention applicants would wish to have prosecuted here if applicants are given the opportunity to see the restriction requirement laid out, and given the time to make an informed decision.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Morris whose telephone number is (703) 308-4533.

PATRICIAL MORNIS PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 120

plm

April 18, 2002